



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/863,406 | 05/24/2001 | Staffan Jonsson | 1291-0183P | 9183 |
| 2292 7590 02/12/2008 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| DUONG, THO V | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 3744 | | | | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 02/12/2008 | | ELECTRONIC | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/863,406

Applicant(s)

JONSSON ET AL.

Examiner

Tho v. Duong

Art Unit

3744

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 32-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 36-56 and 61-63 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 32-35 and 66 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 57-60, 64 and 65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 November 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendment filed 11/13/07 is acknowledged. Claims 32-66 are pending. Claims 36-56 and 61-63 remain withdrawn from further consideration.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/26/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument that reference to Foulke fails to disclose the Cobalt Chloride remaining in solid state and Foulke discloses not only Cobalt Chloride but a list of suitable materials, has been very carefully considered but is not deemed to be persuasive. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this instant case, the base reference is the applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA), which discloses substantially all of applicant's claimed invention, which includes the substance remain in the solid state. However, AAPA does not disclose that the substance that used in the chemical heat pump is CoCl_2 . The CoCl_2 substance that can be used in a chemical heat pump is clearly not novel since Foulke discloses a chemical heat pump that uses CoCl_2 as the absorbing substance for a purpose of producing a large energy per mole of the absorbing material. Therefore, basing on combination of these references, the rejection of claims 57-60 and 64-65 remains proper. Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that the CoCl_2 of Foulke is used differently from the main reference (AAPA) (such as one is in solid and the other is in liquid state), the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the

claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In this instant case, the use of CoCl₂ as a substance in a chemical heat pump in Foulke would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art to try to employ the CoCl₂ in the chemical heat pump of AAPA for an obvious reason that CoCl₂ is capable of producing a large energy per mole.

Regarding applicant's argument that since Foulke disclose not only CoCl₂ but a list of many other suitable materials, there is no reasonable way for one skilled in the art to arrive the specific combination of elements in independent claim 57 including an active solid and a sorbate, has been very carefully considered but is not found to be persuasive. The fact that Foulke discloses many other suitable materials beside CoCl₂, does not exclude CoCl₂ from being one of the substance material obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to try to employ in the chemical heat pump of AAPA, which already discloses a combination of active solid substance and a sorbate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 57-60 and 64-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the

relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Regarding claim 57, the new range of temperature "20-100 degrees Celsius" is not supported by the original disclosure.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 57-60 and 64-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The limitation of " 20-100C within a temperature range of substantially 0-100C" renders the scope of the claim indefinite since a broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989). The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 57 recites the broad recitation 0-100C, and the claim also recites 20-100C which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claims 57-60 and 64-65 are further rejected as can be best understood by the examiner.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 57-60 and 64-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Foulke (US 4,146,013). Applicant discloses (figure 1) a prior art of a chemical heat pump having an active solid substance fixed in a location and existing in a solid state in an accumulator (1) and a sorbate such as water. However, the AAPA does not disclose the claimed property and material of the active substance. Foulke discloses (table 1 and column 3, lines 33-53) a solar chemical heat pump that utilizes Cobalt Chloride (CoCl_2) as an absorbing material for the purpose of producing a large energy per mole of the absorbing material. CoCl_2 clearly possesses the properties as claimed as indicated in the applicant's specification. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Foulke's teaching in the AAPA's heat pump for the purpose of producing a large energy per mole of the absorbing material.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 32-35 and 66 are allowed.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tho v. Duong whose telephone number is 571-272-4793. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tyler J. Cheryl can be reached on 571-272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tho v Duong/
Tho v Duong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3744

/T. v. D./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3744
February 4, 2008